

REMARKS

This Response is in reply to the Office Action mailed on February 25, 2009. Applicant has enclosed herewith a petition for a three-month extension of time along with the requisite fee.

Applicant hereby cancels Claims 1 – 58 and adds new Claims 59 - 70 as described in the above listing of claims. Applicant asserts that the amendments are supported by the specification of the application as filed and do not contain new matter. Applicant has also submitted replacement drawings herewith.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Examiner rejected Claim 6 as failing to comply with the enablement requirement of 35 USC § 112. Because Applicant has cancelled Claim 6, this rejection is moot and Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner withdraw this ground of rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102 and 103

Applicant has cancelled Claims 1 – 58 and avers that Examiner's rejection of those claims is therefore moot. Applicant has entered new claims directed specifically to managing security personnel on a real property site, wherein a security guard is issued a wireless handheld computing device that allows for the guard to interact with the host computer system, both receiving instructions from the host and transmitting data to the host. Upon receipt of an incident or completion report from a security guard, the host computer system will notify a manager of the report.

Applicant avers that the prior art cited by the Examiner does not disclose such a system or method and does not render such a system or method obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art. With respect to the primary reference, U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2002/0125998 to Petite, Applicant asserts that the reference does not teach an interactive system where a human being can receive instructions on a portable device and enter data into

a portable device. Rather, Petite at most teaches a portable transceiver / actuator that receives actuator signals for controlling a mechanical device. *See, e.g.*, Petite, ¶ [0044]. This is unlike Applicant's claimed invention wherein a human security guard receives instructions on his wireless handheld computing device for conducting a security tour.

Examiner cites U.S. Pat. No. 6,078,255 to Dividock for teaching an inspection tour with posts and scheduled tasks. Dividock, however, does not teach the use of a portable device comprising updateable display means wherein the security guard can receive instructions while on the tour. Rather, in Dividock, the security guard must follow the pre-set tour and cannot receive instructions in real-time on his portable device. *See, e.g.*, Dividock, col. 6, l. 1 – col. 7, l. 6 and Fig. 1. Thus, Dividock teaches away from Applicant's invention and does not have the advantage of receiving instructions in real-time that may deviate from the ordinary tasks to be performed on a security tour.


Finally, Examiner cites U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2008/0065456 to Labedz for the creation and entering of a work order into a central system. However, Labedz's work orders are initiated by a third-party vendor or customer. *See* Labedz, ¶ [0051]. By contrast, Applicant's amended claims recite security tours, not work orders. Further, Applicant's security tours are not entered by a third-party vendor or customer.

Conclusion

In conclusion, Applicant submits that the cited prior art does not render Applicant's amended claims obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art. Rather, the prior art teaches away from Applicant's system and method wherein a security guard can receive instructions on a portable device and input data into the portable device for transmission back to the host computer system. Applicant therefore requests allowance of all claims, as amended.

If any additional fees are due in connection with the filing of this Response or the accompanying papers, such as fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, please charge the fees to SGR Deposit Account No. 02-4300, Order No. 048219.00301. If an additional extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is necessary that is not accounted for in the papers filed herewith, such an extension is requested. The additional extension fee also should be charged to SGR Deposit Account No. 02-4300, Order No. 048219.00301. Any overpayment can be credited to Deposit Account No. 02-4300, Order No. 048219.00301.

Respectfully submitted,



Dana T. Hustins
Reg. No. 62,069

Dated: August 24, 2009
SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP
1230 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Suite 3100, Promenade II
Atlanta, GA 30309-3592
TEL: (404) 815-3564
FAX: (404) 685-6864